

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CLASSES OF
SPHERICAL MATRIX DISTRIBUTIONS

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 10

KAI-TAI FANG AND HAN-FENG CHEN
INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIA SINICA
AND
WUHAN UNIVERSITY

APRIL 1984

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE
CONTRACT DAAG 29-82-K-0156

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CLASSES OF SPHERICAL MATRIX DISTRIBUTIONS

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 10

KAI-TAI FANG AND HAN-FENG CHEN

INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIA SINICA

AND

WUHAN UNIVERSITY

APRIL 1984

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE
CONTRACT DAAG 29-82-K-0156

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

THE VIEW, OPINIONS, AND/OR FINDINGS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR(S) AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED AS AN OFFICIAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY POSITION, POLICY, OR DECISION, UNLESS SO DESIGNATED BY OTHER DOCUMENTATION.

1. Introduction.

The theory of multivariate analysis has been based mainly on the normal population. Statisticians have been trying to extend the sample theory in multivariate analysis to cases of the observations being not necessarily either normal or independent. In the last decade, especially the last five years, many statisticians have been interested in a specific class of distributions, one of elliptically contoured distributions, and found that this class has many properties similar to the normal distribution.

If the c.f. (characteristic function) of an n -dimensional random vector \tilde{x} has the form $\exp(it'\tilde{\mu})\phi(t'\tilde{\Sigma}t)$, where $\tilde{\mu}: n \times 1$, $\tilde{\Sigma}: n \times n$ and $\tilde{\Sigma} \geq 0$, we say that \tilde{x} has an elliptically contoured distribution with parameters $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\Sigma}$, and ϕ , and write $\tilde{x} \sim EC_n(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\Sigma}, \phi)$. When $\tilde{\mu} = 0$ and $\tilde{\Sigma} = I_n$, we call $EC_n(0, I_n, \phi)$ a spherical distribution and write $\tilde{x} \sim S_n(\phi)$, because $\tilde{x} \sim S_n(\phi)$ iff $\tilde{x} \stackrel{d}{=} \Gamma \tilde{x}$ for each $\Gamma \in O(n)$, where $O(n)$ is the set of $n \times n$ orthogonal matrices and the notation " $\tilde{x} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{y}$ " means that \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} have the same distribution.

As an extension of multivariate normal sampling theory, several classes of spherical matrix distributions are defined and have been discussed by many authors. Here are the main three classes.

Definition 1. Let $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p)$ be an $n \times p$ random matrix.

(1) $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{\tilde{X}: \Gamma \tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{X} \text{ for every } \Gamma \in O(n)\}$. The \tilde{X} in \mathcal{F}_1 is called left-spherical by Dawid (1977).

(2) $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{\tilde{X}: (\Gamma_1 \tilde{x}_1, \dots, \Gamma_p \tilde{x}_p) \stackrel{d}{=} (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p) \text{ for every } \Gamma_i \in O(n), i = 1, \dots, p\}$.

(3) $\mathcal{F}_3 = \{\tilde{X}: \Gamma(\text{vec } \tilde{X}) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{vec } \tilde{X} \text{ for every } \Gamma \in O(np)\}$. Each of \mathcal{F}_1 , \mathcal{F}_2 , and \mathcal{F}_3 is called a class of spherical matrix distributions.

These classes contain many important distributions, such as the multivariate normal distributions, the multivariate t-distributions, the multivariate Beta-distributions and the multivariate stable laws. The class F_1 was studied by Dawid (1977, 1978), Fraser and Ng (1980), Jensen and Good (1981), and Kariya (1981a and b). The class F_2 was defined by Anderson and Fang (1982b), and the class F_3 was discussed by Chmielewski (1980), Kariya (1981a), Jensen and Good (1981) and Anderson and Fang (1982b and c). They have found that many statistics are invariant in these classes. However the relationships among these classes are not yet very clear. Therefore it may be valuable to consider the relationships among them.

Throughout this paper, $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p) = (\tilde{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{(n)})' = (x_{ij})$ denotes an $n \times p$ random matrix with $n \geq p$, \tilde{I}_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix, $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denotes an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal elements a_1, \dots, a_n , \tilde{A}' , $\text{rk}\tilde{A}$ and $\text{tr}\tilde{A}$ denote the transpose of \tilde{A} , the rank of \tilde{A} and the trace of \tilde{A} , $\tilde{u}^{(n)}$ denotes a random vector which is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , and $\Omega_n(\tilde{t}'\tilde{t})$ denotes its c.f.

In Section 2 some basic properties about them are listed. Sections 3 and 4 are the main part of the paper. In the last section we summarize the invariant distributions in these classes as a table for applications.

2. Preliminary.

In this section we recall some basic properties of F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 which will be used frequently in this paper. The following lemmas and Theorem 1 are from Dawid (1977), Kariya (1981), and Anderson and Fang (1982b).

Let $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p)$ be an $n \times p$ matrix.

Lemma 1.

- (1) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ iff the c.f. of \tilde{X} has the form $\phi(\tilde{T}'\tilde{T})$;
- (2) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ iff the c.f. of \tilde{X} has the form $\phi(\tilde{t}'\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}'\tilde{t}_p)$;
- (3) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ iff the c.f. of \tilde{X} has the form $\phi(\text{tr}\tilde{T}'\tilde{T})$.

Lemma 2. Suppose \tilde{X} has a pdf (probability density function).

Then

- (1) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ iff the pdf of \tilde{X} has the form $f(\tilde{X}'\tilde{X})$;
- (2) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ iff the pdf of \tilde{X} has the form $f(\tilde{x}_1'\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p'\tilde{x}_p)$;
- (3) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ iff the pdf of \tilde{X} has the form $f(\text{tr}\tilde{X}'\tilde{X})$.

Theorem 1.

- (a) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ if $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$, where \tilde{A} and \tilde{U}_1 are independent, $\tilde{U}_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $\tilde{U}_1'\tilde{U}_1 = \tilde{I}_p$;
- (b) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ iff $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R}$, where $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_p)$ and $\tilde{U}_2 = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p)$ are independent, $\tilde{R}_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, and $\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p$ i.i.d. $\tilde{u}_1 \stackrel{d}{=} u^{(n)}$;
- (c) $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ iff $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{R} \tilde{U}_3$, where $\tilde{R} \geq 0$ and \tilde{U}_3 are independent, $\text{vec } \tilde{U}_3 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{u}^{(np)}$.

The distribution of \tilde{U}_1 is called the uniform distribution. The matrices \tilde{U}_1 , \tilde{U}_2 and \tilde{U}_3 play roles of coordinate systems in \mathcal{F}_1 , \mathcal{F}_2 and \mathcal{F}_3 , respectively. In this paper when we write $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{R} \tilde{U}_3$, $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R}$, and $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$, they have the meaning in Theorem 1 unless we make another explanation.

Lemma 3. The distribution of \tilde{X} is fully determined by that of $\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}$ if $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$, by that of $(\tilde{x}_1'\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p'\tilde{x}_p)$ if $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$, and by that of $\text{tr}\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}$ if $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$.

Lemma 3 shows us that if $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_1$, and $\tilde{X}'\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}'\tilde{Y}$, then $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}$. Similar statements hold for \mathcal{F}_2 and \mathcal{F}_3 .

The following properties of the operation " $\stackrel{d}{=}$ " are given by Anderson and Fang (1982a):

(1) If $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}$ and $f_i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, are Borel functions, then $(f_1(\tilde{X}), \dots, f_m(\tilde{X})) \stackrel{d}{=} (f_1(\tilde{Y}), \dots, f_m(\tilde{Y}))$.

(2) If z is independent of \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} , respectively, then

(a) $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}$ implies $z\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} z\tilde{Y}$;

(b) if $P(z > 0) = 1$ and the c.f. of $\log z \phi_{\log z}(t) \neq 0$ for almost all t then $z\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} z\tilde{Y}$ implies $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}$.

Lemma 4. Suppose $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $P(|\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}|=0) = 0$, then

(1) $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{B}$ implies $\tilde{A} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{B}$, where \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} are two upper triangular matrices with positive diagonal elements;

(2) $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Q} \tilde{T}$, where $\tilde{Q}'\tilde{Q} = \tilde{I}_p$ and \tilde{T} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements, implies $\tilde{Q} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1$ and \tilde{Q} is independent of \tilde{T} .

Proof. The existence of \tilde{A} in (1) follows from the argument of Dawid (1977). We consider mapping $f: \tilde{A} \rightarrow f(\tilde{A}) = \tilde{A}'\tilde{A}$, where \tilde{A} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements. Clearly, f is a one-to-one mapping. As $\tilde{A}'\tilde{A} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{B}'\tilde{B}$, then (1) follows from $E[h(\tilde{A})] = E[h(f^{-1}(\tilde{A}'\tilde{A}))] = E[h(f^{-1}(\tilde{B}'\tilde{B}))] = E[h(\tilde{B})]$ for each Borel

function $h \geq 0$. Note that if $|\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}| \neq 0$, there is a unique decomposition $\tilde{X} = \tilde{Q}\tilde{T}$, where $\tilde{Q}'\tilde{Q} = \tilde{I}_p$ and \tilde{T} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements. Let the function $g(\tilde{X}) = (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{T})$, we have $(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{T}) = g(\tilde{X}) \stackrel{d}{=} g(\tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}) = (\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{A})$ as $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$, which completes the proof. Q.E.D.

From now on when we write $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$ for $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$, we always consider that \tilde{A} is an upper triangular matrix with nonnegative diagonal elements.

3. Relationships among $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3$.

By Definition 1, clearly $\mathcal{F}_1 \supset \mathcal{F}_2 \supset \mathcal{F}_3$. But how much are the differences among them at all? In this section, we will discuss them in the following aspects: the coordinate system and the coordinate transformations, marginal distributions, marginal densities and sphericity. First of all, start with \tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2 and \tilde{U}_3 .

Lemma 5. Suppose $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $P(\tilde{x}_i = 0) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. Then $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ iff \tilde{X} satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $\tilde{x}_1/\|\tilde{x}_1\|, \dots, \tilde{x}_p/\|\tilde{x}_p\|$ are independent; and
- (2) $(\|\tilde{x}_1\|, \dots, \|\tilde{x}_p\|)$ and $(\tilde{x}_1/\|\tilde{x}_1\|, \dots, \tilde{x}_p/\|\tilde{x}_p\|)$ are independent.

Proof. The assertion follows from Anderson and Fang (1982b). Q.E.D.

Corollary 1. $\tilde{U}_1 \notin \mathcal{F}_2$.

Proof. As $\tilde{U}_1'\tilde{U}_1 = \tilde{I}_p$ and $\tilde{U}_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $\tilde{U}_1 = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p)$ where $\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p$ are not independent, the corollary follows from Lemma 5. Q.E.D.

Lemma 6. $\tilde{U}_2 \notin \mathcal{F}_3$.

Proof. Suppose $\tilde{U}_2 = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p) = (\tilde{u}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{(n)})' \in \mathcal{F}_3$, then $\tilde{U}_2 \stackrel{d}{=} RU_3$ for some $R \geq 0$ being independent of \tilde{U}_3 . As $\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p$ are independent and $\tilde{u}_{(i)}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) has a spherical distribution, the distribution of $\tilde{u}_{(i)}$ must be normal and the distribution of \tilde{U}_2 must be normal by Kelker (1970). The contradiction proves the theorem. Q.E.D.

The following example shows us that the condition (2) in Lemma 5 is necessary, and its distribution belongs to \mathcal{F}_1 , but not to \mathcal{F}_2 .

Example 1. Let \tilde{X} be an $n \times p$ random matrix with a pdf $f(\tilde{X}) = c |\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{X}'\tilde{X}|^{-\frac{1}{2}(n+p)}$, where c is a constant. We want to prove that $(\|\tilde{x}_1\|, \dots, \|\tilde{x}_p\|) \equiv (R_1, \dots, R_p)$ and $(\tilde{x}_1/\|\tilde{x}_1\|, \dots, \tilde{x}_p/\|\tilde{x}_p\|) \equiv \tilde{U}$ are not independent. It is easy to see that if $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(R_1, \dots, R_p)$ and \tilde{U} are independent, then $f(\tilde{X}) = f(\tilde{U}\tilde{R})$ can be written in the form of $f(\tilde{X}) = g_1(\tilde{R})g_2(\tilde{U})$; similarly $|\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{X}'\tilde{X}| = h_1(\tilde{R})h_2(\tilde{U})$ for some two functions h_1 and h_2 . Take $\tilde{R} = \tilde{I}_p$ and $\tilde{U}'\tilde{U} = \tilde{I}_p$, respectively, to show

$$|\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{X}'\tilde{X}| = |\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{R}\tilde{U}'\tilde{U}\tilde{R}| = k |\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{R}^2| |\tilde{I}_p + \tilde{U}'\tilde{U}|,$$

for each $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(R_1, \dots, R_p)$ with $R_1 > 0, \dots, R_p > 0$, $\tilde{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, and $u_i' u_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, where k is a constant. Let $\tilde{R} = t^{-1} \tilde{I}_p$, $t > 0$, we have

$$k|t^2 \mathop{I_p} \nolimits + \mathop{I_p} \nolimits| |\mathop{I_p} \nolimits + \mathop{U'U} \nolimits| = |t^2 \mathop{I_p} \nolimits + \mathop{U'U} \nolimits|, \text{ for each } t > 0,$$

i.e.

$$k(1+t^2)^p \prod_{i=1}^p (1+\lambda_i) = \prod_{i=1}^p (t^2 + \lambda_i), \text{ for each } t > 0,$$

where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathop{U'U} \nolimits$. Obviously, this is impossible. This contradiction reveals that $\mathop{R} \nolimits$ and $\mathop{U} \nolimits$ are not independent.

3.1 Coordinate transformations.

In this paragraph we try to give the stochastic representations for F_1 , F_2 and F_3 under the same "coordinate system". Maybe they can help us to understand these classes more clearly. The generalized Dirichlet distribution defined by Anderson and Fang (1982a) will be used. Consider a random vector $(z_1, \dots, z_m)'$ such that $(z_1, \dots, z_m) \stackrel{d}{=} R^2(d_1, \dots, d_m)$, where $0 \leq R \sim F(\cdot)$, R is independent of (d_1, \dots, d_m) , $d_1 + \dots + d_m = 1$, and $(d_1, \dots, d_{m-1}) \sim D_m(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}; \alpha_m)$ (Dirichlet distribution) with $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m > 0$ and $n = 2(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_m)$ is an integer; we write $(z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}) \sim G_m(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}; \alpha_m; F)$ or $(z_1, \dots, z_m) \sim G_m(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m; F)$.

Anderson and Fang (1982b) pointed out that if $\mathop{U_3} \nolimits \stackrel{d}{=} \mathop{U_2 R} \nolimits$ with $R = \text{diag}(\mathop{R_1} \nolimits, \dots, \mathop{R_p} \nolimits)$, then $(\mathop{R_1}^2, \dots, \mathop{R_{p-1}}^2) \sim D_p(\frac{1}{2}n, \dots, \frac{1}{2}n; \frac{1}{2}n)$ and $\mathop{R_1}^2 + \dots + \mathop{R_p}^2 = 1$. Also $\mathop{X} \nolimits \stackrel{d}{=} \mathop{R U_3} \nolimits \in F_3$ and $R \sim F(\cdot)$ iff $\mathop{X} \nolimits \stackrel{d}{=} \mathop{U_2 R} \nolimits$ with $\mathop{R} \nolimits = \text{diag}(\mathop{R_1}^2, \dots, \mathop{R_p}^2) \sim G_p(\frac{1}{2}n, \dots, \frac{1}{2}n; F)$.

Let $\mathop{Y} \nolimits = (y_{ij}) = (\mathop{y_1} \nolimits, \dots, \mathop{y_p} \nolimits)$ be an $n \times p$ random matrix with i.i.d. elements and $y_{ij} \sim N(0, 1)$. There exists an upper triangular matrix $T = (t_{ij})$ with positive diagonal elements such that $\mathop{T'} \nolimits \mathop{T} \nolimits = \mathop{Y'} \nolimits \mathop{Y} \nolimits$.

This is the famous Bartlett decomposition. It is a well-known fact that $\{t_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq j \leq p\}$ are independent, $t_{ij} \sim N(0,1)$ for $i < j$ and $t_{ii}^2 \sim \chi_{n-i+1}^2$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. Let $\tilde{t}_j = (t_{1j}, \dots, t_{jj})'$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. Then we have

Theorem 2. Suppose $\tilde{U}_2 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$, where \tilde{A} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements. Then $\tilde{A} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{T} \tilde{R}^{-1}$, where $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(\|\tilde{t}_1\|, \dots, \|\tilde{t}_p\|)$.

Proof. As $(\tilde{y}_1/\|\tilde{y}_1\|, \dots, \tilde{y}_p/\|\tilde{y}_p\|) \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_2 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y} = \tilde{T}' \tilde{T}$, we have $\tilde{y}_i' \tilde{y}_i = \tilde{t}_i' \tilde{t}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, and

$$\tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y} \tilde{R}^{-1} = (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p) \tilde{R}^{-1} = \tilde{Q} \tilde{T} \tilde{R}^{-1}$$

where $\tilde{Q} \tilde{T}$ is the Bartlett decomposition for $(\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p)$ and $\tilde{Q}' \tilde{Q} = \tilde{I}_p$. By Lemma 4, we have $\tilde{T} \tilde{R}^{-1} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{A}$ which completes the proof. Q.E.D.

Remark. Let $\tilde{A} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})$, $\tilde{a}_i = (\tilde{a}_{1i}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{ii})'$, $\tilde{a}_i^* = (\tilde{a}_{1i}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{i-1,i})'$ and $\tilde{a}_i^{(2)} = (\tilde{a}_{1i}^2, \dots, \tilde{a}_{ii}^2)$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. Then by Theorem 2, we obtain the following facts:

- (1) $\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_p$ are independent;
- (2) $\tilde{a}_k^* \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{u}_k$, where \tilde{u}_k is the first $(k-1)$ -component subvector of $\tilde{u}_k^{(n)}$, $k = 2, \dots, p$; and
- (3) $\tilde{a}_k^{(2)} \sim D_k(\frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}(n-k))$, $k = 2, \dots, p$.

Corollary 1. $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ iff $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A} \tilde{R}$, where \tilde{U}_1 , \tilde{A} , and $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_p) \geq 0$ are independent, and \tilde{A} is given by Theorem 2.

Theorem 3. Let $\tilde{U}_3 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{B}$; then $\tilde{B} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{T} / (\text{tr} \tilde{T}' \tilde{T})^{1/2}$.

Proof. By using the above notation, we have $\tilde{Y}'(\text{tr}\tilde{Y}'\tilde{Y})^{1/2} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_3$ and $\tilde{T}'\tilde{T}/\text{tr}\tilde{T}'\tilde{T} = \tilde{Y}'\tilde{Y}/\text{tr}\tilde{Y}'\tilde{Y} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{B}'\tilde{B}$. Note \tilde{B} is also an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements, then $\tilde{B} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{T}/(\text{tr}\tilde{T}'\tilde{T})^{1/2}$. Q.E.D.

Corollary 1. $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ iff $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} RU_1\tilde{B}$, where $R \geq 0$, U_1 , and \tilde{B} are independent, and \tilde{B} is given by Theorem 3.

3.2 Classes of marginal distributions.

Let \mathcal{F}_i^c ($i=1,2,3$) denote the set of first columns of \tilde{X} 's in \mathcal{F}_i ($i=1,2,3$), i.e., $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_i^c$ iff there exist $\tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ such that $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_p) \in \mathcal{F}_i$ ($i=1,2,3$). Similarly, \mathcal{F}_i^r indicates a set of the first row vector of \tilde{X} in \mathcal{F}_i ($i=1,2,3$). Clearly $\mathcal{F}_1^c \supset \mathcal{F}_3^c \supset \mathcal{F}_3^r$ and $\mathcal{F}_1^r \supset \mathcal{F}_2^r \supset \mathcal{F}_3^r$, since $\mathcal{F}_1 \supset \mathcal{F}_2 \supset \mathcal{F}_3$. Also $\mathcal{F}_2^c = \mathcal{F}_1^c$, in fact if $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_1^c$ let $\tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ be $p-1$ $n \times 1$ random vectors such that $\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ are iid; thus $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_p) \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Here we use a useful fact that if $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p)$ with $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ i.i.d. and $\tilde{x}_1 \sim EC_n(0, I_n, \phi)$, then $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Naturally, one may ask if $\mathcal{F}_3^c = \mathcal{F}_2^c$ holds. But that is not true. First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7. $\Omega_n(\tilde{t}'\tilde{t})$ with $\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is not an $n+1$ -dimensional c.f.

Proof. Suppose $\Omega_n(\tilde{t}'\tilde{t})$ with $\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an $(n+1)$ -dimensional c.f. Then there exists a distribution function F such that (c.f. Cambanis, Huang and Simons (1981))

$$(3.1) \quad \Omega_n(u) = \int_0^\infty \Omega_{n+1}(ur^2) dF(r), \quad u \geq 0,$$

i.e., $\underline{u}^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} R \underline{u}_{\sim n}$, where R is independent of $\underline{u}_{\sim n}$, $R \geq 0$, and $\underline{u}_{\sim n}$ is the subvector of $\underline{u}^{(n+1)}$ with the first n components. Since $\underline{u}_{\sim n}$ has a pdf and $P(R=0) = P(R \underline{u}_{\sim n} = 0) = P(\underline{u}^{(n)} = 0) = 0$, $\underline{u}^{(n)}$ has a pdf. This is a contradiction, which completes the proof. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4. The set F_3^c is a proper subset of F_2^c if $p > 1$.

Proof. Let $\underline{u} \stackrel{d}{=} \underline{u}^{(n)}$. Clearly, $\underline{u} \in F_2^c$, we want to point out $\underline{u} \notin F_3^c$. Suppose $\underline{u} \in F_3^c$; then there exist $\underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_p$ such that $\underline{U} = (\underline{u}, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_p) \in F_3$. Let $\phi(\text{tr} \underline{t}' \underline{t})$ denote the c.f. of \underline{U} . Then the c.f. of \underline{u} is $\phi(\underline{t}' \underline{t}_1) = \Omega_n(\underline{t}' \underline{t}_1)$, $\underline{t}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., $\phi(\cdot) = \Omega_n(\cdot)$. That means that $\Omega_n(\underline{t}' \underline{t}) = \phi(\underline{t}' \underline{t})$, $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{np}$, is a c.f. By Lemma 7, the contradiction proves the theorem. Q.E.D.

Let us consider the row marginal distributions. First, we want to point out that F_2^r is a proper subset of F_1^r .

Lemma 8. Suppose $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_p) = (\underline{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \underline{x}_{(n)})' \in F_2$ and the covariance of $\underline{x}_{(1)}$ exists. Then

(1) $\text{Cov}(\underline{x}_{(i)}, \underline{x}_{(j)}) = \delta_{ij} \Lambda_i$, where Λ_i is a diagonal matrix and $\delta_{ii} = 1$, and $\delta_{ij} = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and

(2) $\text{Cov}(\underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j) = \delta_{ij} \sigma_{ii}^2 I_n$, where σ_{ii}^2 will be given in the proof, $i, j = 1, \dots, p$.

Proof. Clearly, $\underline{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \underline{x}_{(n)}$ are identically distributed and

$$(3.2) \quad \underline{x} \stackrel{d}{=} \underline{U}_2^R = (R \underline{u}_1, \dots, R \underline{u}_p),$$

where $\tilde{R}, \tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p$ are independent. As $E\tilde{u}_2 = \tilde{0}$, we have $E\tilde{x}_{(k)} = \tilde{0}$, and $E\tilde{x}_j = \tilde{0}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, p$. By (3.2)

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{x}_{(i)}, \tilde{x}_{(j)}) = E\tilde{x}_{(i)}\tilde{x}'_{(j)} = \text{diag}(ER_1^2\tilde{u}_{i1}\tilde{u}_{j1}, \dots, ER_p^2\tilde{u}_{ip}\tilde{u}_{jp}).$$

The first assertion follows from $E\tilde{u}_{ik}\tilde{u}_{jk} = 0$ for $i \neq j; k = 1, \dots, p$. Similarly, $E\tilde{x}_i\tilde{x}'_j = ER_iR_jE\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}'_j = \delta_{ij}ER_{i \sim n}^2/n$. and the Lemma follows.

Let $\tilde{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{(n)}$ be i.i.d., $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \sim N(\tilde{0}, \tilde{\Sigma})$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is not a diagonal matrix; by Lemma 8, then $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \notin F_2^r$, but $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_1^r$. Thus F_2^r is a proper subset of F_1^r .

Theorem 5. Suppose $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{(n)})' \in F_2$, then $\tilde{x} \in F_3$ iff $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_3^r$.

Proof. The "only if" part is obvious. Suppose $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_3^r$; then $\tilde{x}_{(1)}$ has a c.f. $\phi(\tilde{t}'_{(1)}\tilde{t}_{(1)})$, where $\phi(\tilde{t}'_{(1)}\tilde{t}_{(1)} + \dots + \tilde{t}'_{(n)}\tilde{t}_{(n)})$ is a c.f. in R^{np} . On the other hand, since $\tilde{x} \in F_2$, \tilde{x} has a c.f. $\psi(\tilde{t}'_{1 \sim 1}, \dots, \tilde{t}'_{p \sim p})$. Hence we must have

$$(3.3) \quad \phi(r_1^2 + \dots + r_p^2) = \psi(r_1^2, \dots, r_p^2), \quad \text{for } r_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, p,$$

because they are all the c.f. of $\tilde{x}_{(1)}$. By (3.3), we have

$\phi(\tilde{t}'_{1 \sim 1} + \dots + \tilde{t}'_{p \sim p}) = \psi(\tilde{t}'_{1 \sim 1}, \dots, \tilde{t}'_{p \sim p})$ for all $\tilde{t}_i \in R^n, i = 1, \dots, p$, i.e., $\tilde{x} \in F_3$. The theorem follows. Q.E.D.

Corollary 1. Suppose $\tilde{x} \in F_2$. Then $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_3^r$ iff $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \sim S_p(\phi)$.

Proof. The "only if" part is trivial. Now suppose $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \sim S_p(\phi)$. By Theorem 5, we get $\tilde{x} \in F_3$ since $\tilde{x} \in F_2$ and $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_3^r$. Q.E.D.

Corollary 2. The first row $\tilde{u}_{(1)}$ of \tilde{U}_1 is not in F_2^r .

Proof. Assume $\tilde{u}_{(1)} \in F_2^r$, then there exists \tilde{Y} such that $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{u}_{(1)}, \tilde{Y})' \in F_2$. As \tilde{U}_1 is right spherical (Dawid (1977)), therefore $\tilde{u}_{(1)} \sim S_p(\phi)$ and $\tilde{u}_{(1)} \in F_3^r$ by $\tilde{X} \in F_2$ and Corollary 1 of Theorem 5. However, it is impossible (cf. the following example). Hence, $\tilde{u}_{(1)} \notin F_2^r$. Q.E.D.

Example 2. Suppose $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \tilde{A}$, where \tilde{U}_1 and \tilde{A} are independent, and $\tilde{A} = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_p)$, $0 < p_i = P(a_i=1) = 1 - P(a_i=0) < 1$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, $a_1 + \dots + a_p = 1$. Clearly $\tilde{X} \in F_1$, but $\tilde{X} \notin F_2$ by Theorem 2. We, however, want to show $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{A} \tilde{u}_{(1)} \in F_2^r$, where $\tilde{u}_{(1)}$ is the first row of \tilde{U}_1 . It can be shown that the c.f. of $\tilde{u}_{(1)}$ is $\Omega_n(t_1^2 + \dots + t_p^2)$ by the sphericity of \tilde{U}_1 . And $\tilde{x}_{(1)}$ has a c.f.

$$(3.4) \quad \psi(t_1^2, \dots, t_p^2) = \int \Omega_n(a_1^2 t_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2 t_p^2) dF(a_1, \dots, a_p) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^p p_i \Omega_n(t_i^2) .$$

By (3.4), we have

$$\psi(t_1^2, \dots, t_p^2) = \sum_{i=1}^p p_i \Omega_n(t_i^2), \quad t_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, p .$$

As $\Omega_n(t_i^2)$ is a c.f. in \mathbb{R}^n and $\sum_{i=1}^p p_i = 1$, $p_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, hence $\psi(t_1^2, \dots, t_p^2)$ is the c.f. of some \tilde{Y} in F_2 and $\tilde{y}_{(1)} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{x}_{(1)}$, where $\tilde{y}_{(1)}$ is the first row of \tilde{Y} ; that means $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \in F_2^r$.

Example 2 shows us that F_2 , related to F_1 , cannot be characterized by its row marginal distributions. But for F_3 , related to F_2 , it can by Theorem 5. Further, it is easy to show that if $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} \in F_2$ and $\tilde{X}(1) \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}(1)$, we have $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{Y}$. However, there is no such property for F_1 .

3.3 Marginal densities.

Let $\tilde{X} \in F_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. In general it is not necessary that \tilde{X} has a density. If \tilde{X} satisfies some suitable additional condition on \tilde{X} , it will have marginal densities.

Suppose $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} RU \in F_3$; if $P(\tilde{X}=0) = P(R=0) = 0$, then all marginal densities exist (Kelker (1970)). Suppose $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} (R_{1\sim 1}, \dots, R_{p\sim p}) \in F_2$; if $P(\tilde{X}_i=0) = P(R_i=0) = 0$, \tilde{X}_i has all marginal densities; if $P(\tilde{X}_i=0) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, then \tilde{X} has marginal densities of a set of elements such that at least one element in each column of \tilde{X} has been deleted. Also, we can prove that if $\tilde{X} \in F_1$ and $P(|\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}|=0) = 0$, then $(x_{11}, \dots, x_{n-1,1}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{n-2,2}, \dots, x_{1p}, \dots, x_{n-p,p})$ and all its subsets have marginal densities.

Further, if $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} U_R \in F_2$, it is easy to see that \tilde{X} has a pdf $f_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}_1', \dots, \tilde{x}_p')$ iff \tilde{R} has a pdf $f_{\tilde{R}}(r_1, \dots, r_p)$, and there exists the following relationship between them (cf. Zhang and Fang (1982), Ch. 9):

$$f_{\tilde{R}}(r_1, \dots, r_p) = (2^p \pi^{np/2} (\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}n))^{-p}) (r_1 \cdots r_p)^{n-1} f_{\tilde{X}}(r_1^2, \dots, r_p^2), \quad r_1, \dots, r_p > 0.$$

Similarly, suppose $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} U_A \in F_1$, where $\tilde{A} = (a_{ij})$ is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements; then \tilde{X} has a pdf $f_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}_1', \tilde{x}_p')$

iff \tilde{A} has a pdf $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{A})$, and $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{A}}$ is related to $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{X}}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{f}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{A}) = 2^p \pi^{pn/2} \frac{p}{(p-1)/4} \prod_{i=1}^p a_{ii}^{n-i} \tilde{f}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{A}'\tilde{A}) \left/ \prod_{i=1}^p \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}(n-i+1)\right)\right.$$

(cf. Srivastava and Khatri (1979)).

4. The Class of Spherical Matrix Distributions.

Let $\tilde{A} \geq 0$ be a $p \times p$ matrix and $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0$ be the eigenvalues of \tilde{A} . We write $\lambda(\tilde{A}) = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$.

Definition 2. (Dawid (1977)). A random $n \times p$ matrix \tilde{X} is called spherical if \tilde{X} and \tilde{X}' are left-spherical, i.e., $\tilde{P}\tilde{X}\tilde{Q} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{X}$ for each $\tilde{P} \in O(n)$ and $\tilde{Q} \in O(p)$. Denote $\mathcal{F}_s = \{\tilde{X}: \tilde{X} \text{ is spherical}\}$.

Lemma 9. (Dawid). $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_s$ iff $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \Lambda \tilde{V}$, where \tilde{U}_1 , Λ , and \tilde{V} are independent, $\Lambda = \lambda((\tilde{X}'\tilde{X})^{1/2})$, $\tilde{U}_1 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{V}'\tilde{V} = \tilde{I}_p$ for each $\tilde{\Gamma} \in O(p)$.

The class of \mathcal{F}_s was studied by Dawid. The c.f. of \tilde{X} in \mathcal{F}_s must have the form $\phi(\lambda(\tilde{T}'\tilde{T}))$, because the maximum invariant of $\tilde{T}(\tilde{T}: n \times p)$ under the transformation $\tilde{P}\tilde{T}\tilde{Q}$ for each $\tilde{P} \in O(n)$ and each $\tilde{Q} \in O(p)$, is $\lambda(\tilde{T}'\tilde{T})$. It is easy to see $\mathcal{F}_1 \supset \mathcal{F}_s \supset \mathcal{F}_3$ and $\tilde{U}_1 \in \mathcal{F}_s$. If $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$, it is not necessary that $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_s$, and vice versa. For example, the \tilde{X} in Example 1 belongs to \mathcal{F}_s , but $\tilde{X} \notin \mathcal{F}_2$. By the following theorem, we see that $\tilde{U}_2 \notin \mathcal{F}_s$.

Theorem 6. $\mathcal{F}_3 = \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{F}_2$.

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_3 \subset \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{F}_2$. Conversely, if $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{F}_2$, the

fact $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{(n)})' \in \mathcal{F}_s$ implies $\tilde{x}_{(1)} \sim S_p(\phi)$ and $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ from Corollary 1 of Theorem 5. The theorem follows. Q.E.D.

Theorem 7. Let $\tilde{U}_3 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \Lambda \tilde{V}$, where \tilde{U}_1 , Λ , and \tilde{V} have the meaning in Lemma 9. Denote $\Lambda^2 = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$, $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0$, then

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) \stackrel{d}{=} (w_1, \dots, w_p) / (w_1 + \dots + w_p),$$

where w_1, \dots, w_p are p eigenvalues of $\tilde{W} \sim W_p(n, \tilde{I}_p)$, and $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p-1})$ has a joint density

$$(3.5) \quad f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p-1}) = \frac{\pi^{p/2} \Gamma(np/2)}{\prod_{\alpha=0}^{p-1} \Gamma(\frac{p-\alpha}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{n-\alpha}{2})} |\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p|^{\frac{1}{2}(n-p-1)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)$$

$$(\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_{p-1} > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_p = 1 - \lambda_1 - \dots - \lambda_{p-1} > 0).$$

and $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p-1})$ is independent of $w = w_1 + \dots + w_p$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{Y} = (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p)$ with $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p$ i.i.d. and $\tilde{y}_1 \sim N_n(0, \tilde{I}_n)$. Then $\tilde{Y}/(\text{tr} \tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y})^{1/2} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_3 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_1 \Lambda \tilde{V}$ and $\lambda(\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y} / \text{tr} \tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y}) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$. Note that $\lambda(\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y} / \text{tr} \tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y}) = \lambda(\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y}) / \text{tr}(\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y})$ and $\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y} \equiv \tilde{W} \sim W_p(n, \tilde{I}_p)$, $\text{tr}(\tilde{Y}' \tilde{Y}) = w_1 + \dots + w_p$ and $\lambda(\tilde{W}) = \text{diag}(w_1, \dots, w_p)$, the first part of the theorem follows. To check (3.5), we note that (w_1, \dots, w_p) has the following pdf (cf. Anderson (1958) or Zhang and Fang (1982)):

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\pi^{p/2}}{2^{np/2} \prod_{\alpha=0}^{p-1} \Gamma(\frac{p-\alpha}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{n-\alpha}{2})} \prod_{i=1}^p w_i^{1/2(n-p-1)} \prod_{i < j} (w_i - w_j) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(w_1 + \dots + w_p)}$$

$$w_1 > \dots > w_p > 0 .$$

Taking the transformation

$$\lambda_i = w_i / (w_1 + \dots + w_p), \quad i = 1, \dots, p-1 ,$$

$$\lambda = w_1 + \dots + w_p ,$$

the Jacobian is λ^{p-1} . Let $\lambda_p = 1 - \lambda_1 - \dots - \lambda_{p-1}$. Now (3.6) becomes

$$\left[\frac{\pi^{p/2} \Gamma(np/2)}{\prod_{\alpha=0}^{p-1} \Gamma(\frac{p-\alpha}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{n-\alpha}{2})} \prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{\frac{1}{2}(n-p-1)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \right] \left[\frac{1}{2^{np/2} \Gamma(\frac{np}{2})} \lambda^{np/2-1} e^{-\lambda/2} \right]$$

which completes the proof. Q.E.D.

Assume $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U} \Lambda \tilde{V} \in \mathcal{F}_s$ (cf. Lemma 9), then \tilde{X} has a pdf $f_{\tilde{X}}(\lambda(\tilde{X}' \tilde{X}))$ if Λ has a pdf $f_{\Lambda}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$, and f_{Λ} is related to $f_{\tilde{X}}$ as follows (cf. Theorem 13.3.1. of Anderson (1958))

$$f_{\Lambda}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) = \frac{\pi^{p(n+1)/2}}{\prod_{\alpha=0}^{p-1} \Gamma(\frac{p-\alpha}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{n-\alpha}{2})} (\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_p)^{\frac{1}{2}(n-p-1)}$$

$$\prod_{i < j} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) f_{\tilde{X}}(\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)), \quad \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_p > 0 .$$

Theorem 8. Assume $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_s$ with independent columns (or rows), then \tilde{X} must be normal.

Proof. From the assumption, the c.f. of \tilde{X} is $\prod_1^p \phi(\tilde{t}_i^t \tilde{t}_i)$, i.e., $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2$. By Theorem 6, $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$. The assertion follows from Kelker (1970). Q.E.D.

This theorem shows that we, in general, should consider dependent sample theory in \mathcal{F}_s . If $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3$, the c.f. of \tilde{X} has the form $\phi(\lambda(\tilde{T}'\tilde{T})) = \phi(\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)) = \psi(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p)$, i.e., the c.f. is the function of $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p$. Here $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ are the eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}'\tilde{T}$ in $Ee^{\text{tr} \tilde{T}'\tilde{T}} \tilde{X}$. We may consider other functions of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ to obtain other different subclasses of \mathcal{F}_s .

5. Applications.

Let $\mathcal{F}_3^+ = \{\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_3: P(\tilde{X} = 0) = 0\}$, $\mathcal{F}_2^+ = \{\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2: P(\tilde{x}_i = 0) = 0, i = 1, \dots, p\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_1^+ = \{\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_1: P(|\tilde{X}'\tilde{X}| = 0) = 0\}$. We call a statistic $t(\tilde{X})$ distribution free on \mathcal{F}_i^+ if $t(\tilde{X}) \stackrel{d}{=} t(\tilde{Y})$ for any $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_i^+$; $i = 1, 2, 3$, respectively.

Theorem 9. Suppose $t(\tilde{X})$ is a statistic. Then

- (a) $t(\tilde{X})$ is distribution free on \mathcal{F}_3^+ iff $t(a\tilde{X}) \stackrel{d}{=} t(\tilde{X})$ for each $a > 0$;
- (b) $t(\tilde{X})$ is distribution free on \mathcal{F}_2^+ iff $t(\tilde{X}\tilde{r}) \stackrel{d}{=} t(\tilde{X})$ for each $\tilde{r} = \text{diag}(r_1, \dots, r_p)$, $r_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$; and
- (c) $t(\tilde{X})$ is distribution free on \mathcal{F}_1^+ iff $t(\tilde{X}\tilde{A}) \stackrel{d}{=} t(\tilde{X})$ for each \tilde{A} , an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements.

Proof. We only prove (b); the other proofs are similar. The "only if" part is trivial. Suppose $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{F}_2^+$ and $\tilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R}$, where $\tilde{R} = \text{diag}(R_1, \dots, R_p)$, $R_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, and \tilde{U}_2 is independent of \tilde{R} . Then for each Borel function $h \geq 0$, we have (by using the assumption that $t(\tilde{X}\tilde{r}) \stackrel{d}{=} t(\tilde{X})$ for each \tilde{r})

$$\begin{aligned}
E(h(t(\tilde{x}))) &= E(h(t(\tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R}))) = \tilde{E}_R(E(h(t(\tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R}))|\tilde{R})) \\
&= \tilde{E}_R(E_{\tilde{U}_2}(h(t(\tilde{U}_2 \tilde{R})))) = \tilde{E}_R(E_{\tilde{U}_2}(h(t(\tilde{U}_2)))) \\
&= E(h(t(\tilde{U}_2))) ,
\end{aligned}$$

which is independent of \tilde{x} in \mathcal{F}_2^+ , the sufficiency follows. Q.E.D.

Remark 1. The assertions (a) and (c) are essentially from Kariya (1981a), but the statement here is a little different from his.

Remark 2. In this paper we have only studied \mathcal{F}_1 , \mathcal{F}_2 , and \mathcal{F}_3 for the case of central standard spherical matrices. If we consider the following transformations: $\mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \{\tilde{x} + \tilde{M}: \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_1\}$, $\mathcal{F}_2 \rightarrow \{\tilde{x} \tilde{\Sigma}^{1/2} + \tilde{M}: \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_3 \rightarrow \{\tilde{x} \tilde{\Sigma}^{1/2} + \tilde{M}: \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_3\}$, where \tilde{M} is an $n \times p$ constant matrix and $\tilde{\Sigma} = \tilde{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}^{1/2}$ is a positive definite matrix, we can generalize our results.

In the rest of this section denote $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}_i^+$ ($i = 1, 2$ or 3) and $\tilde{W} = \tilde{x}' \tilde{D}_{\tilde{n}} \tilde{x}$, where $\tilde{D}_{\tilde{n}} = \tilde{I}_{\tilde{n}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \tilde{1}_{\tilde{n}} \tilde{1}_{\tilde{n}}' / \tilde{n}$ and $\tilde{1}_{\tilde{n}} = (1, \dots, 1)'$. For convenience of applications, some basic invariant statistics in \mathcal{F}_1^+ , in \mathcal{F}_2^+ , and in \mathcal{F}_3^+ are listed in Table 1. They are

(1) The Wilks statistic. Let $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1', \tilde{x}_2')'$, $\tilde{x}_1: n_1 \times p$, $\tilde{x}_2: n_2 \times p$, $n_1 \geq p$, and $n_2 \geq p$. Let $\tilde{W}_k = \tilde{x}_k' \tilde{D}_{n_k} \tilde{x}_k$, $k = 1, 2$. The Wilks statistic is

$$t_1(\tilde{x}) = |\tilde{W}_1| / |\tilde{W}_1 + \tilde{W}_2| .$$

(2) The multivariate Beta statistic. Let $\tilde{W}_0 = \tilde{W}_1 + \tilde{W}_2$, where \tilde{W}_1 and \tilde{W}_2 are given in (1). The multivariate Beta statistic is

$$t_2(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{w}_0^{-1/2} \tilde{w}_1 \tilde{w}_0^{-1/2} .$$

(3) The Hotelling T^2 -statistic. It is

$$t_3(\tilde{x}) = n(n-1) \tilde{x}' \tilde{w}^{-1} \tilde{x} ,$$

where $\tilde{x} = \tilde{x}' \tilde{1}_n / n$.

Table 1.

Distribution-free Properties of the Invariant Statistics

Statistics	F_1^+	F_2^+	F_3^+
$t_1(x)$	free	free	free
$t_2(x)$	free	free	free
$t_3(x)$	free	free	free
$t_4(x)$	free	free	free
$t_5(x)$	not	free	free
$t_6(x)$	not	free	free
$t_7(x)$	not	not	free
$t_8(x)$	not	not	not
$t_9(x)$	not	not	not

(4) The statistic testing equality of covariance matrices.

Partition $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}_1', \dots, \tilde{x}_r')'$, where $\tilde{x}_k: n_k \times p$, $n_k \geq p$, $k = 1, \dots, r$.

Let $\tilde{w}_k = \tilde{x}_k' D_{n_k} \tilde{x}_k$, $k = 1, \dots, r$ and $\tilde{w}_0 = \sum \tilde{w}_k$. The statistic is

$$t_4(\tilde{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^r |\tilde{w}_k|^{n_k/2} / |\tilde{w}_0|^{n/2} .$$

(5) The correlation coefficients. It is easy to see that the sample correlation coefficient between \tilde{x}_i and \tilde{x}_j can be expressed as

$$r_{ij} = \tilde{x}_{i \sim n \sim j}' D \tilde{x}_{i \sim n \sim j} / (\tilde{x}_{i \sim n \sim i \sim j \sim n \sim j}' D \tilde{x}_{i \sim n \sim i \sim j \sim n \sim j})^{1/2} .$$

Let

$$t_5(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{R} = (r_{ij}) .$$

(6) The canonical correlation coefficients. Partition \tilde{W} into

$$\tilde{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}_{11} & \tilde{w}_{12} \\ \tilde{w}_{21} & \tilde{w}_{22} \end{bmatrix} , \quad \tilde{w}_{11}: q \times q, \quad \tilde{w}_{22}: (p-q) \times (p-q) .$$

The canonical correlation coefficients $t_6(\tilde{x})$ are the eigenvalues of $\tilde{w}_{12} \tilde{w}_{22}^{-1} \tilde{w}_{21} \tilde{w}_{11}^{-1}$. When $q = 1$, we get the multiple correlation coefficient.

(7) Testing the hypothesis that a covariance matrix is proportional to a given matrix. Assume $\text{Cov}(\tilde{x}_{(1)}) = \tilde{\Sigma}$ exists; the statistic testing $H: \tilde{\Sigma} = \sigma^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_0 > 0$ is

$$t_7(\tilde{x}) = |\tilde{\Sigma}_0^{-1} \tilde{W}| / (\text{tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}_0^{-1} \tilde{W})/p)^p .$$

(8) Testing the hypothesis that a covariance matrix is equal to a given matrix. The statistic testing $H: \tilde{\Sigma} = \tilde{\Sigma}_0 > 0$ is

$$t_8(\tilde{x}) = |\tilde{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_0^{-1}|^{n/2} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\tilde{W} \tilde{\Sigma}_0^{-1})) .$$

(9) The generalized variance.

$$t_g(\tilde{X}) = |\tilde{X}' \tilde{D}_{\tilde{n}} \tilde{X}| .$$

Acknowledgment.

The authors wish to thank T. W. Anderson for assistance with this paper.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T. W. (1958), An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Anderson, T. W., and Fang, K. T. (1982a), Distributions of quadratic forms and Cochran's Theorem for elliptically contoured distributions and their applications, Technical Report No. 53, ONR Contract N00014-75-C-0442, Department of Statistics, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Anderson, T. W., and Fang, K. T. (1982b), On the theory of multivariate elliptically contoured distributions and applications, Technical Report No. 54, ONR Contract N0014-75-C-0442, Department of Statistics, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Anderson, T. W., and Fang, K. T. (1982c), Maximum likelihood estimators and likelihood ratio criteria for multivariate elliptically contoured distributions, Technical Report No. 1, ARO Contract DAAG29-82-K-0156, Department of Statistics, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Cambanis, S., Huang, S., and Simons, G. (1981), On the theory of elliptically contoured distributions, Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 11, 368-385.

Chmielewski, M. A. (1980), Invariant scale matrix hypothesis tests under elliptical symmetry, Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 10, 343-350.

Dawid, A. P. (1977), Spherical matrix distributions and a multivariate model, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B, 39, 254-2601.

Dawid, A. P. (1978), Extendibility of spherical matrix distributions, Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 8, 559-566.

Fraser, D.A.S., and Ng, K. W. (1980), Multivariate regression analysis with spherical error, Multivariate Analysis 5 (P.R. Krishnaiah, Ed.), 369-386, North-Holland, New York.

Jensen, D. R., and Good, I. J. (1981), Invariant distributions associated with matrix laws under structural symmetry, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B, 43, 327-332.

Kariya, T. (1981a), Robustness of multivariate tests, The Annals of Statistics, 9, 1267-1275.

Kariya, T. (1981b), A robustness property of Hotelling's T^2 -problem, The Annals of Statistics, 9, 210-214.

Kariya, T., and Eaton, M. L. (1977), Robust tests for spherical symmetry, The Annals of Statistics, 5, 206-215.

Kelker, D. (1970), Distribution theory of spherical distributions and location scale parameter generalization, Sankhya A, 32, 419-430.

Srivastava, M. S., and Khatri, C. G. (1979), An Introduction to Multivariate Statistics, North-Holland, New York.

Zhang, Y., and Fang, K. T. (1982), An Introduction to Multivariate Analysis, Science Press, Beijing.

TECHNICAL REPORTS

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE - CONTRACT DAA29-82-K-0156

1. "Maximum Likelihood Estimators and Likelihood Ratio Criteria for Multivariate Elliptically Contoured Distributions," T. W. Anderson and Kai-Tai Fang, September 1982.
2. "A Review and Some Extensions of Takemura's Generalizations of Cochran's Theorem," George P.H. Styan, September 1982.
3. "Some Further Applications of Finite Difference Operators," Kai-Tai Fang, September 1982.
4. "Rank Additivity and Matrix Polynomials," George P.H. Styan and Akimichi Takemura, September 1982.
5. "The Problem of Selecting a Given Number of Representative Points in a Normal Population and a Generalized Mills' Ratio," Kai-Tai Fang Shu-Dong He, October 1982.
6. "Tensor Analysis of ANOVA Decomposition," Akimichi Takemura, November 1982.
7. "A Statistical Approach to Zonal Polynomials," Akimichi Takemura, January 1983.
8. "Orthogonal Expansion of Quantile Function and Components of the Shapiro-Francia Statistic," Akimichi Takemura, April 1983.
9. "An Orthogonally Invariant Minimax Estimator of the Covariance Matrix of a Multivariate Normal Population," Akimichi Takemura, April 1983.
10. "Relationships Among Classes of Spherical Matrix Distributions," Kai-Tai Fang and Han-Feng Chen, April 1984.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 10	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Relationships among Classes of Spherical Matrix Distributions		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Kai-Tai Fang and Han-Feng Chen		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAG 29-82-K-0156
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Statistics - Sequoia Hall Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS P-19065-M
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Office Post Office Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709		12. REPORT DATE April 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 23
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The view, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Bartlett decomposition, elliptically contoured distribution, invariant statistics, uniform distribution on the Stiefel manifold, spherical matrix distribution.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Several classes of spherical matrix distributions have been studied by many authors. In this paper the relationship among the classes are discussed in the following aspects: the characteristic functions in these classes, coordinate transformations, marginal distributions, marginal densities, and sphericity. Some statistics that are invariant in these classes are listed for applications.		